

Portable Monitoring Devices for Diagnosis of Obstructive Sleep Apnea at Home: Review of Accuracy, Cost-Effectiveness, Guidelines, and Coverage in Canada

Adapted from Ndegwa S, Clark M, Argáez C. <u>Portable Monitoring Devices for Diagnosis of Obstructive Sleep Apnea at Home: Review of Accuracy, Cost-Effectiveness, Guidelines, and Coverage in Canada</u>. (Health Technology Inquiry Service). Ottawa: Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health; 2009.

Introduction

Obstructive sleep apnea (OSA) is a syndrome that is characterized by recurrent episodes of partial (hypopnea) or complete (apnea) upper airway obstruction during sleep despite ongoing respiratory efforts. The symptoms include excessive daytime sleepiness, impaired concentration, and snoring. OSA has been linked to an increased risk of motor vehicle accidents, ^{2,3} hypertension, ⁴⁻⁶ cardiovascular disease, ⁷⁻⁹ neurocognitive changes, ^{10,11} and stroke. ^{12,13} Approximately 4% of men and 2% of women have OSA. ^{14,15} Polysomnography (PSG) is the gold standard investigation used in the diagnosis of OSA. 16 The costs of using PSG in a sleep laboratory are high because of the cost of the examination time, the need for a qualified technician and sleep specialist, and equipment costs. ¹⁷ Furthermore, OSA is often undiagnosed because of long wait times to see a sleep physician and receive a diagnosis. 18 As a result. the requirement of using laboratory PSG to obtain an accurate diagnosis of OSA has been debated for years, and the use of portable monitoring devices has been proposed. 17,19,20 This report reviews the evidence on the accuracy and cost-effectiveness of using portable monitoring devices for the diagnosis of OSA at home and in the laboratory when compared with laboratory PSG. Current guidelines, information on the portable monitoring devices available in Canada, coverage of devices by private and public health plans in Canada, and the level of patient compliance with continuous positive

airway pressure (CPAP) treatment when OSA is diagnosed are reviewed.

Objective

The objective of the report is to answer the following research questions:

- Which portable monitoring devices for the diagnosis of obstructive sleep apnea at home are available in Canada?
- What is the accuracy of using portable monitoring devices for the diagnosis of obstructive sleep apnea at home compared with laboratory-based testing? Which patient populations are most suitable for home diagnosis using portable monitoring devices? Is there evidence for the use of portable monitoring devices in a supervised setting?
- What is the cost-effectiveness of using portable monitoring devices compared with laboratory-based testing for the diagnosis of obstructive sleep apnea?
- What are the guidelines for using portable monitoring devices for the diagnosis of obstructive sleep apnea at home?
- What is the level of patient compliance with continuous positive airway pressure treatment of obstructive sleep apnea?
- What jurisdictions provide coverage for devices that are used for the diagnosis and treatment of obstructive sleep apnea at home? How much coverage is provided and under what conditions?

Methods

Published literature was obtained by searching databases between 2003 and October 2008. Filters were applied to limit the retrieval to health technology assessments (HTAs), systematic reviews, meta-analyses, economic analyses, and guidelines. A randomized

controlled trial (RCT) filter was applied to retrieve RCTs from 2007 to January 2009. The websites of regulatory agencies, HTA organizations, and related agencies were also searched. The Google search engine was used to search for information on the Internet. These searches were supplemented by handsearching the bibliographies of selected papers. Two reviewers screened and selected articles for inclusion in this report.

Results

Portable monitoring devices available in Canada

Several portable monitoring devices are available in Canada for use in the diagnosis of OSA. Most machines measure respiration and oxygenation directly. ²⁰⁻²² Several evolving technologies measure these variables indirectly through peripheral arterial tone and actigraphy.

Health technology assessments

Two HTAs published in 2007 were retrieved in the search. ^{23,24} One of the key findings of the first HTA report²³ was that, for those with a high pretest probability of moderate-to-severe OSA (based on medical history, reported daytime sleepiness, and other measures), initial management using laboratory PSG does not result in better outcomes than an ambulatory approach in terms of diagnosis, CPAP titration, or response to CPAP therapy. Level 2 and 3 portable monitors produced accurate results in the diagnostic assessment of OSA when laboratory PSG was used as the reference. Accurate results were also achieved using level 4 portable monitors measuring at least three parameters. Diagnostic accuracy decreased for level 4 monitors measuring two or fewer parameters. The accuracy of portable monitors seemed to be better in studies that were

conducted in sleep laboratories compared with studies that were conducted at home. In the second HTA report, results obtained from modelling different strategies showed a trade-off for time to diagnosis and CPAP therapy versus test accuracy. After the release of these assessments, the US Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services decided to cover CPAP therapy for adults who were diagnosed using PSG or home testing.

Systematic reviews and metaanalyses

Two systematic reviews^{25,26} and one metaanalysis²⁷ not included in the identified HTAs were reviewed. The results from a 2007 systematic review showed that diagnostic accuracy increases with manual scoring compared with automatic scoring. The low sensitivity that was demonstrated with the use of pulse oximetry alone indicated that it is insufficient for the diagnostic assessment of OSA. Findings from a 2006 meta-analysis suggested that home sleep studies provided similar diagnostic information when compared with laboratory PSG but may underestimate the severity of OSA. Portable sleep studies were also significantly more likely to give a poor recording when compared with laboratory PSG. A 2003 systematic review found that sensitivities and specificities were generally higher for level 2 and level 3 portable monitors than for level 4 portable monitors. The percentage of portable monitoring studies that did not collect adequate data was generally higher when not attended by a sleep technician. There was limited evidence on the use of portable monitors in an unattended setting. Based on these findings, the research group recommended against the use of portable monitoring devices for the diagnosis of OSA at home

Randomized controlled trials

Two RCTs^{28,29} not included in the identified HTAs or systematic reviews were retrieved. One RCT^{28} (n = 106) assessed whether CPAP compliance and clinical outcomes differed between patients who were randomly assigned to home diagnosis and CPAP autotitration or conventional laboratory PSG. At a six-week follow-up clinic visit, CPAP compliance and the clinical outcomes evaluated did not differ between the two groups. Another RCT^{29} (n = 62) compared the utility and reliability of a portable monitoring device in patients who were randomly assigned to receive portable monitoring simultaneously with PSG or portable monitoring at home. The results indicated that portable monitoring at home is less sensitive for the diagnosis of OSA when compared with portable monitoring conducted in the laboratory. The use of wrist actigraphy tended to overestimate sleep time and did not significantly improve the accuracy of portable monitoring at home.

Economic analyses and cost information

One cost-utility analysis²³ and one informal cost comparison³⁰ were identified. The cost-utility analysis indicated that portable monitoring followed by CPAP autotitration or split-night PSG may be cost-effective alternatives to full-night PSG for diagnosis and treatment initiation for OSA.²³ The informal cost comparison showed that in the US, Spain, UK, and France, portable sleep studies were 35% to 88% less costly than laboratory sleep studies.³⁰

Guidelines

Four clinical practice guidelines outlining the use of portable monitoring devices for the diagnosis of OSA were retrieved. 24-26,31 Three of these guidelines recommend limiting the use of portable monitoring devices to those patients with a high pretest probability of moderate-to-severe OSA and without other potentially confounding medical conditions or sleep disorders. 24,25,31 In addition, they recommend the maintenance of the same high technical standards during home testing as those that would be found in an accredited sleep centre. A

fourth guideline recommends the use of actigraphy as a method to estimate total sleep time when PSG is unavailable.²⁶

Although CPAP is the cornerstone of therapy for OSA, compliance is often poor.³² Several factors may influence treatment initiation and compliance with CPAP, including severity of symptoms, cost to the patient, frequency of follow-up, satisfaction with mode of therapy, education about the health consequences of OSA, and level of discomfort including claustrophobia and upper airway side effects.

A survey was conducted to assess which Canadian jurisdictions provide coverage for devices that are used in the diagnosis and treatment of OSA at home. Responses were received from all jurisdictions except Quebec, Northwest Territories, and Nunavut. Public funding of CPAP equipment is available in Ontario, Alberta, Manitoba, New Brunswick, Saskatchewan, Newfoundland and Labrador, and the Yukon. The only jurisdiction that funds private testing at home using a portable monitoring device for oximetry is the Yukon. British Columbia, Prince Edward Island, and Nova Scotia do not provide coverage for devices that are used at home for the diagnosis or treatment of OSA. Several private medical insurance policies cover CPAP equipment, but the amount of aid varies between insurers, and there may be variations in benefits between individual and group policies at the same firm.³³

Limitations

Most studies evaluating portable monitoring devices have been conducted on Caucasian male patients with no comorbidities and a high pretest probability of OSA. Consequently, the results of these studies may not be generalizable to other groups of patients. Most studies assessing portable monitors for diagnostic accuracy were conducted simultaneously with the use of PSG in a laboratory. Hence, it is difficult to assess the utility of portable monitoring devices for use at home. Studies examining long-term, clinically important outcomes in patients

Conclusions

Although laboratory PSG is the standard test used in the diagnosis of OSA, there is evidence that, among patients with a high pretest probability of moderate-to-severe OSA with no comorbidities, portable monitoring devices may be useful for the diagnostic evaluation of patients when there is limited access to laboratory sleep studies and sleep specialists. Pulse oximetry that is used alone is not recommended for the diagnostic evaluation of OSA. Canadian jurisdictions should take local needs and resources into account when considering reimbursement of portable monitoring at home.

References

- Bassiri AG, Guilleminault C. Clinical features and evaluation of obstructive sleep apneahypopnea syndrome. 3rd edition. In: Kryger MH, Roth T, Dement WC, editors. Principles and practice of sleep medicine. Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders; 2000.
- 2. Findley LJ, Unverzagt ME, Suratt PM. Automobile accidents involving patients with obstructive sleep apnea. Am Rev Respir Dis. 1988 Aug;138(2):337-40.
- Young T, Blustein J, Finn L, Palta M. Sleepdisordered breathing and motor vehicle accidents in a population-based sample of employed adults. Sleep. 1997 Aug;20(8):608-13.
- Peppard PE, Young T, Palta M, Skatrud J. Prospective study of the association between sleep-disordered breathing and hypertension. N Engl J Med. 2000 May 11;342(19):1378-84.
- Bixler EO, Vgontzas AN, Lin HM, Ten HT, Leiby BE, Vela-Bueno A, et al. Association of hypertension and sleep-disordered breathing. Arch Intern Med. 2000 Aug 14;160(15):2289-95.
- 6. Nieto FJ, Young TB, Lind BK, Shahar E, Samet JM, Redline S, et al. Association of sleep-disordered breathing, sleep apnea, and hypertension in a large community-based study. Sleep Heart Health Study. JAMA. 2000 Apr 12;283(14):1829-36.
- 7. Hung J, Whitford EG, Parsons RW, Hillman DR. Association of sleep apnoea with

- myocardial infarction in men. Lancet. 1990 Aug 4;336(8710):261-4.
- 8. Shahar E, Whitney CW, Redline S, Lee ET, Newman AB, Javier NF, et al. Sleep-disordered breathing and cardiovascular disease: cross-sectional results of the Sleep Heart Health Study. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2001 Jan;163(1):19-25.
- 9. Peker Y, Carlson J, Hedner J. Increased incidence of coronary artery disease in sleep apnoea: a long-term follow-up. Eur Respir J. 2006 Sep;28(3):596-602.
- 10. Engleman HM, Douglas NJ. Sleep. 4: Sleepiness, cognitive function, and quality of life in obstructive sleep apnoea/hypopnoea syndrome. Thorax. 2004 Jul;59(7):618-22.
- 11. Durmer JS, Dinges DF. Neurocognitive consequences of sleep deprivation. Semin Neurol. 2005 Mar;25(1):117-29.
- 12. Dyken ME, Somers VK, Yamada T, Ren ZY, Zimmerman MB. Investigating the relationship between stroke and obstructive sleep apnea. Stroke. 1996 Mar;27(3):401-7.
- 13. Arzt M, Young T, Finn L, Skatrud JB, Bradley TD. Association of sleep-disordered breathing and the occurrence of stroke. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2005 Dec 1;172(11):1447-51.
- 14. Lee W, Nagubadi S, Kryger MH, Mokhlesi B. Epidemiology of obstructive sleep apnea: A population-based perspective. Expert Rev Respir Med. 2008;2(3):349-64.
- Young T, Palta M, Dempsey J, Skatrud J, Weber S, Badr S. The occurrence of sleepdisordered breathing among middle-aged adults. N Engl J Med. 1993 Apr 29;328(17):1230-5. Temp ID 575.
- 16. Kline LR. Clinical presentation and diagnosis of obstructive sleep apnea-hypopnea in adults. In: UpToDate [database online]. Waltham (MA): UpToDate; 2008 [cited 2008 Oct 10].
- 17. Littner MR. Portable monitoring in the diagnosis of the obstructive sleep apnea syndrome. Semin Respir Crit Care Med. 2005 Feb;26(1):56-67.
- Flemons WW, Douglas NJ, Kuna ST, Rodenstein DO, Wheatley J. Access to diagnosis and treatment of patients with suspected sleep apnea. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2004 Mar 15;169(6):668-72.

- 19. Ahmed M, Patel NP, Rosen I. Portable monitors in the diagnosis of obstructive sleep apnea. Chest. 2007 Nov;132(5):1672-7.
- Collop NA. Portable monitoring for the diagnosis of obstructive sleep apnea. Curr Opin Pulm Med. 2008 Nov;14(6):525-9.
- 21. Patel MR, Alexander TH, Davidson TM. Home sleep testing. Operative Techniques in Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery. 2007 Mar;18(1):33-51.
- 22. Health Canada. Medical Devices Active Licence Listing (MDALL) [Internet]. Ottawa: Medical Devices Bureau, Therapeutic Products Directorate, Health Canada; 2007 [cited 2008 Oct 10]. Available from: http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/dhp-mps/mdim/licen/mdlic e.html
- 23. Deutsch PA, Simmons MS, Wallace JM. Costeffectiveness of split-night polysomnography and home studies in the evaluation of obstructive sleep apnea syndrome. J Clin Sleep Med. 2006 Apr 15;2(2):145-53.
- 24. Recommendations for the diagnosis and treatment of sleep apnea: 2008 update [Internet]. Ottawa: Canadian Thoracic Society; 2008. (Canadian respiratory guidelines). [cited 2008 Oct 9]. Available from: http://www.lung.ca/cts-sct/pdf/1000_THO_SleepApnea_v10.pdf
- Diagnosis and treatment of obstructive sleep apnea [Internet]. Bloomington (MN): Institute for Clinical Systems Improvement (ICSI);
 2008 [cited 2008 Oct 10]. Available from: http://www.icsi.org/sleep_apnea/sleep_apnea_diagnosis_and_treatment_of_obstructive_.ht ml
- Morgenthaler T, Alessi C, Friedman L, Owens J, Kapur V, Boehlecke B, et al. Practice parameters for the use of actigraphy in the assessment of sleep and sleep disorders: an update for 2007. Sleep. 2007 Apr 1;30(4):519-29.

- 27. Kribbs NB, Pack AI, Kline LR, Smith PL, Schwartz AR, Schubert NM, et al. Objective measurement of patterns of nasal CPAP use by patients with obstructive sleep apnea. Am Rev Respir Dis. 1993 Apr;147(4):887-95.
- 28. Berry RB, Hill G, Thompson L, McLaurin V. Portable monitoring and autotitration versus polysomnography for the diagnosis and treatment of sleep apnea. Sleep. 2008 Oct 1;31(10):1423-31.
- 29. Garcia-Diaz E, Quintana-Gallego E, Ruiz A, Carmona-Bernal C, Sanchez-Armengol A, Botebol-Benhamou G, et al. Respiratory polygraphy with actigraphy in the diagnosis of sleep apnea-hypopnea syndrome. Chest. 2007 Mar;131(3):725-32.
- 30. Ghegan MD, Angelos PC, Stonebraker AC, Gillespie MB. Laboratory versus portable sleep studies: a meta-analysis. Laryngoscope. 2006 Jun;116(6):859-64.
- 31. Collop NA, Anderson WM, Boehlecke B, Claman D, Goldberg R, Gottlieb DJ, et al. Clinical guidelines for the use of unattended portable monitors in the diagnosis of obstructive sleep apnea in adult patients.

 Journal of Clinical Sleep Medicine [Internet]. 2007 Dec 15 [cited 2009 Oct 9];3(7):737-47. Available from: http://www.aasmnet.org/JCSM/Articles/03071 3.pdf
- 32. Haniffa M, Lasserson TJ, Smith I.
 Interventions to improve compliance with continuous positive airway pressure for obstructive sleep apnoea. Cochrane Database Syst Rev [Internet]. 2004 [cited 2008 Oct 10];(4):CD003531, 2004. Available from: http://www.mrw.interscience.wiley.com/cochrane/clsysrev/articles/CD003531/pdf_fs.html
- 33. Re: CPAP assistance program application [Internet]. Edmonton: The Lung Association, Alberta & NWT, CPAP Assistance Program. 2008 [cited 2008 Nov 5]. Available from: http://www.ab.lung.ca/sitewyze/files/Applicati on Package.pdf

Production Notes

CADTH Technology Overviews is produced by: Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health (CADTH) 600-865 Carling Ave.

Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1S 5S8 *Tel*: 613-226-2553

Fax: 613-226-5392 Website: www.cadth.ca

CADTH Technology Overviews contains articles that are based on CADTH Technology Reports and other CADTH reports on health technologies. The information presented in these publications is intended to help Canadian health care decision-makers, health care professionals, health systems leaders, and policy-makers make well-informed decisions and thereby improve the quality of health care services. The information in this publication should not be used as a substitute for the application of clinical judgment in respect to the care of a particular patient or other professional judgment in any decision-making process, nor is it intended to replace professional medical advice.

While CADTH has taken care in the preparation of this publication to ensure that its contents are accurate, complete, and up to date as of the date of publication, CADTH does not make any guarantee to that effect. CADTH is not responsible for any errors or omissions or injury, loss or damage arising from or relating to the use (or misuse) of any information, statements, or conclusions contained in or implied by the information in this publication or in any of the source documentation.

CADTH Technology Overviews and the information it provides is prepared and intended for use in the context of the Canadian health care system. Other health care systems are different; the issues and information related to the subject matter presented in this publication may be different in other jurisdictions and, if used outside of Canada, it is at the user's risk. This disclaimer and any questions or matters of any nature arising from or relating to the content or use (or misuse) of this publication will be governed by and interpreted in accordance with the laws of the Province of Ontario and the laws of Canada applicable therein, and all proceedings shall be subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the courts of the Province of Ontario, Canada.

CADTH takes sole responsibility for the final form and content of this publication, subject to the limitations noted above. The statements and conclusions in this publication are those of CADTH and not of its advisory committees and reviewers. The statements, conclusions, and views expressed herein do not necessarily represent the views of Health Canada or any Canadian provincial or territorial government.

Production of *CADTH Technology Overviews* is made possible by financial contributions from Health Canada and the governments of Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba, New Brunswick, Newfoundland and Labrador, Northwest Territories, Nova Scotia, Nunavut, Prince Edward Island, Saskatchewan, and Yukon.

Copyright © CADTH 2010. You are permitted to reproduce this document for non-commercial purposes, provided it is not modified when reproduced and appropriate credit is given to CADTH. You may not otherwise copy, modify, translate, post on a website, store electronically, republish, or redistribute any content from this document in any form or by any means without the prior written permission of CADTH.

Please contact CADTH's Vice-President of Corporate Services at corporateservices@cadth.ca with any inquiries about this notice or other legal matters relating to CADTH's services.

Cite as: Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health. CADTH Technology Overviews, 2010; 1(4).

ISSN: 1481-4501 (online)